

REMARKS**Status Of The Claims**

The Decision has been reviewed, and its contents carefully considered. Claims 1 and 3-22 are pending. Claims 1 and 3-22 have been rejected. Claims 1, 12, 17, 18, and 21 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 and 3-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,181,992 to Gurne *et al.* (“Gurne”). Applicants respectfully traverse. In an effort to advance prosecution, however, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 17, and 21 to recite that a technician or end user arranges the order of the performance measurements in any desired order. It is respectfully submitted that Gurne does not teach or suggest Applicants’ claimed invention.

Each of independent claims 1, 17, and 21 recite that a technician or end user arranges the order of the performance measurements. Gurne does not disclose this feature. The Decision states “[g]iven that the broadest reasonable interpretation of the ‘arranging the order’ limitation includes the system designer arranging the order in which the items will be displayed...”, this feature is disclosed by Gurne. Decision, page 10. The Decision also states, however, that “[a]s claimed, the arranging is not limited to ‘the technician or end user’ nor is it limited to ‘any desired order.’” *Id.*

As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 17, and 21 to recite that the order is arranged in any desired order by a technician or end user. Gurne does not disclose

this feature. Only a system designer in Gurne may arrange the order of in which a list is displayed. Gurne does not enable a technician or end user to arrange the order in any desired order. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 17, and 21 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 3-11 and 18-20 ultimately depend from at least one of independent claims 1, 17, and 21. Therefore, claims 3-11 and 18-20 are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Regarding independent claim 12, the Decision concedes that Gurne “does not describe that the first and second graphical representations are related by varying a time axis of the first graphical representation of said selected data over a portion of said data.” Decision, page 12. The Decision further states that U.S. Patent No. 5,790,819 to Rosenberg *et al.* (“Rosenburg”) discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully traverse. In an effort to advance prosecution, however, Applicants have amended independent claim 12 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 16, that is, that the graphics program can vary the length of the time axis driving different intervals of the performance measurement. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Gurne nor Rosenberg appear to disclose this feature.

In an Examiner’s Answer dated November 18, 2004 (“Answer”), the Examiner states that, regarding claim 16, Gurne discloses that “logging information represents a snapshot or window of information of which the user can freeze in time as well as the parameters around the time of the trigger.” Answer, page 8. The Answer refers Applicants’ attention to column 11, lines 10-54 of Gurne. This passage merely discusses identifying a predetermined period of time for analysis. This passage does not disclose, nor does any other passage in Gurne, varying the length of the time axis driving different intervals of the performance measurement.


As claimed by Applicants, a graph time frame may include, for example, a first non-zoomed-in region, a middle zoomed-in region, and a second non-zoomed-in region. *See, e.g.*, page 21, lines 4-12. Thus, Applicants' claimed invention enables different intervals to be used for performance measurements. Neither Gurne nor Rosenberg appear to disclose such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 is allowable and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 15, and 16 ultimately depend from independent claim 12. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 15, and 16 are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned on (202) 861-1706.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Raphael A. Valencia
Reg. No. 43,216

Date: May 8, 2006
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783